



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

09/997,391

11/30/2001

Saiprasad V. Naimpally

MATP-617US

5564

23122

7590

06/13/2008

RATNERPRESTIA

P O BOX 980

VALLEY FORGE, PA 19482-0980

EXAMINER

WOZNIAK, JAMES S

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2626

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

06/13/2008

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 09/997,391	Applicant(s) NAIMPALLY ET AL.	
	Examiner JAMES S. WOZNAK	Art Unit 2626	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 28 February 2008.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1,3-6 and 9-26 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1,3-6 and 9-26 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 30 November 2001 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

1. In response to the office action from 12/17/2007, the applicant has submitted an amendment, filed 2/28/2008, amending independent claims 1, 11, 15, and 17, while arguing to traverse the art rejection based on the amended limitations (*Amendment, Pages 11-14*).

Response to Arguments

2. Applicant's arguments have been fully considered but they are not persuasive for the following reasons:

With respect to **Claim 17** and its dependents, the applicant argues that Chang (*U.S. PG Publication: 2004/0168187*) fails to teach that a sequence (*including an initial and further portions*) of EPG speech files are sent to an audio speaker without changing the text of the displayed page (*Amendment, Pages 11-12*). In support of this traversal, the applicant points out that Chang only extracts subsequent EPG data when a user selects a program which opens a specific program text description on a display (*Fig. 3*) that is different from the originally displayed page (*Fig. 5*). These arguments have been fully considered, but are moot with respect to the new grounds of rejection necessitated by the amended claims and in further view of Adams et al (*"IBM Products for Persons with Disabilities," 1989*).

With respect to **Claims 1, 11, 15**, and their dependents, the applicant argues that Chang and Davis et al (*U.S. Patent: 5,822,123*) fails to teach extracting a further section of speech data corresponding to a subsequent time interval without receiving a user input for the further extracted sections (*Pages 13-15*). These arguments have been fully considered, but are moot with respect to the new grounds of rejection necessitated by the amended claims and in further view of Hong et al (*U.S. Patent: 5,737,030*).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. **Claims 1, 10-12, 14-16, and 22-23** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chang (*U.S. Patent Publication: 2004/0168187*) in view of Davis et al (*U.S. Patent: 5,822,123*) and further in view of Hong et al (*U.S. Patent: 5,737,030*).

With respect to **Claims 1 and 11**, Chang recites:

(a) Storing electronic program guide (EPG) data in a database at the remote location (*server capable of EPG text data storage, Fig. 6, Element 86; and Paragraph [0034]*);

(b) Storing EPG speech files (*server capable of EPG voice data storage, Fig. 6, Element 86; and Paragraph [0034]*);

(c) Receiving a request for a portion of the EPG speech files from step (b), the portion of

Art Unit: 2626

the EPG speech files corresponding to a particular time interval, the portion including a plurality of sections, each section representing a respectively different sub-interval of the portion of the EPG speech files (*request for EPG text and voice data corresponding to a particular day, Paragraph [0034]; and received EPG data for a programming time block corresponding to different time intervals, Figs. 4-5*);

(d) Retrieving the requested portion from the stored EPG speech files and transmitting to the information appliance the portion of the EPG speech files requested in step (c) (*transmission of EPG voice data to a user device, Paragraph [0034]; Fig. 6; and set top box as a means for receiving EPG data, Paragraph 0002*);

(e) Receiving and storing the portion of the EPG speech files in the information appliance transmitted in step (d) (*receiving and storing EPG voice data at a user device, Paragraph [0020]*);

(f) Presenting a sequence of aural prompts to a user, prompting the user to select time information corresponding to a section of the stored EPG data to be extracted (*chronological sequence listing of available television programs, more detailed EPG data provided upon selection of a program based on time in a guide mode, and associated EPG voice data, Paragraphs [0021 and 0031-0032] and Figs. 3-5*);

(g) Navigating through the stored EPG speech files in the information appliance, responsive to the aural prompts, to extract a section of the stored EPG speech files (*receiving controller keypad commands at a microcontroller to navigate available television programs, Paragraph [0027-0031]; and presenting EPG voice data prompts corresponding to a particular television program, Paragraph [0032]*); and

(h) Presenting the extracted section of the stored EPG speech files extracted in step (g) through audio speakers (*announcing an EPG voice message using a speaker, Paragraph [0032]*).

Chang further discloses that EPG data, which is in the form of text (*see Figs. 3-5*), is converted to voice data (*i.e., text-to-speech synthesis*) and stored at a network server along with the EPG data (*Fig. 6, Element 86; and Paragraph [0034]*).

Although Chang discloses that a sequence of time-based speech EPG data is provided to a user so that the user can retrieve further EPG speech files for a particular channel, as is noted above (*see also Figs. 3 and 5*), Chang does not provide for allowing a user to select time information to further retrieve EPG speech data for different channels for that interval. Davis, however, discloses a well-known EPG navigation means that prompts a user to select a particular time interval using sequential hints to allow the user to receive further program information for a plurality of different channels at the selected interval (*Figs. 43A and 43C; Col. 35, Lines 7-37*). Davis also notes that EPG data is provided in the form of a speech signal (*Col. 11, Lines 17-38*). Davis also teaches the use of a set top box for receiving and storing EPG data (*Col. 9, Lines 1-7*), while Chang discloses a mean for communicating EPG data between a controller and other devices (*Paragraph [0037]; and set top box, Paragraph [0002]*).

Chang and Davis are analogous art because they are from a similar field of endeavor in EPG audio data providing systems. Thus, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art, at the time of invention, to modify the teachings of Chang with the time-based browsing scheme taught by Davis in order to provide a user with further formats for selecting program information (*Davis, Col. 4, Lines 57-59*).

Although Chang in view of Davis teaches a speech-assisted EPG system having a time-based interval selection, Chang in view of Davis does not specifically suggest further providing subsequent EPG data in the form of speech without receiving a user input for the further extracted section. Hong, however, teaches that a sequence of EPG speech data is presented to a user corresponding to a current/selected time interval and subsequent program time intervals (*displayed information is presented to a user as speech, Fig. 5; and Col. 7, Lines 1-16*).

Chang, Davis, and Hong are analogous art because they are from a similar field of endeavor in EPG voice data providing systems. Thus, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art, at the time of invention, to modify the teachings of Chang in view of Davis with the voice information for subsequent time intervals taught by Hong in order to provide an illiterate or vision impaired individual with the full content of an electronic program guide (*Hong, Col. 2, Lines 40-43*).

With respect to **Claim 10**, Chang further discloses:

Transmitting to the information appliance the portion of the EPG speech files at a periodic interval of time (*daily reception of EPG voice data, Paragraph [0034]*); and

Storing the transmitted portion of the EPG speech files in a memory device of the information appliance (*storing EPG voice data in a voice memory, Paragraph [0020]*).

With respect to **Claim 12**, Chang further discloses:

Receiving the EPG audio data at periodic time intervals (*daily transmission of EPG voice data, Paragraph [0034]*).

With respect to **Claim 14**, Chang further discloses:

Presenting the EPG audio data by announcing at least a channel and selecting the channel

for one of listening and viewing (*announcing a channel name and number, Paragraph [0032]; and channel selection, Paragraph [0027]*).

With respect to **Claim 15**, Chang discloses:

A memory device (*voice data and guide memory, paragraph [0020] and Fig. 2, Elements 42 and 44*);

A modem adapted to connect to a network (*communications interface to communicate with a network to receive EPG data, Paragraph [0020]; and Fig 2, Element 38*);

A processor coupled to the modem (*DSP and microcontroller, Fig. 2, Elements 40 and 46*) for (a) communicating on the network (*network communication of EPG data, Paragraphs [0034-0037]*), (b) periodically receiving portions of electronic program guide (EPG) speech files from the network, each portion corresponding to a respectively different time interval and each portion including a plurality of sections each representing a respectively different sub interval of the respective portion (*daily reception of EPG voice data for a programming interval, Paragraph [0034]; and received EPG data for a programming time block corresponding to different time intervals, Figs. 4-5*), (c) storing the portion of EPG speech files in the memory device (*storing EPG voice data to a voice memory, Paragraph [0020]*), and (d) providing a sequence of aural navigation prompts to a user, prompting the user to select time information corresponding to a section of the stored EPG data to be extracted (*chronological sequence listing of available television programs, more detailed EPG data provided upon selection of a program based on time in a guide mode, and associated EPG voice data, Paragraphs [0021 and 0031-0032] and Figs. 3-5*);

A receiver for accepting input commands from a remote control, the input commands

entered responsive to the sequence of aural navigation prompts (*receiving controller keypad commands at a microcontroller to select a particular television program, Paragraph [0027]*);

An audio speaker configured with the processor to present the sequence of aural navigation prompts (*speaker, Fig. 2, Element 14*); and

The processor responsive to the input commands accepted by the receiver for (a) extracting a portion of the EPG speech files stored in the memory device (*selecting voice messages corresponding to television programs, Paragraph [0032]*), (b) sending the extracted portion of the EPG speech files to the audio speaker (*sending an EPG voice message to a speaker, Paragraph [0032]*), the portion of the EPG speech files corresponding to a particular time interval (*EPG voice data corresponding to a time interval for a particular TV program, Figs. 3 and 5*).

Although Chang discloses that a sequence of time-based speech EPG data is provided to a user so that the user can retrieve further EPG speech files for a particular channel, as is noted above (*see also Figs. 3 and 5*), Chang does not provide for allowing a user to select time information to further retrieve EPG speech data for different channels for that interval. Davis, however, discloses a well-known EPG navigation means that prompts a user to select a particular time interval using sequential hints to allow the user to receive further program information for a plurality of different channels at the selected interval (*Figs. 43A and 43C; Col. 35, Lines 7-37*). Davis also notes that EPG data is provided in the form of a speech signal (*Col. 11, Lines 17-38*).

Chang and Davis are analogous art because they are from a similar field of endeavor in EPG audio data providing systems. Thus, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art, at the time of invention, to modify the teachings of Chang with the time-based

browsing scheme taught by Davis in order to provide a user with further formats for selecting program information (*Davis, Col. 4, Lines 57-59*).

Although Chang in view of Davis teaches a speech-assisted EPG system having a time-based interval selection, Chang in view of Davis does not specifically suggest further providing subsequent EPG data in the form of speech without receiving a user input for the further extracted section. Hong, however, teaches that a sequence of EPG speech data is presented to a user corresponding to a current/selected time interval and subsequent program time intervals (*displayed information is presented to a user as speech, Fig. 5; and Col. 7, Lines 1-16*).

Chang, Davis, and Hong are analogous art because they are from a similar field of endeavor in EPG voice data providing systems. Thus, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art, at the time of invention, to modify the teachings of Chang in view of Davis with the voice information for subsequent time intervals taught by Hong in order to provide an illiterate or vision impaired individual with the full content of an electronic program guide (*Hong, Col. 2, Lines 40-43*).

With respect to **Claim 16**, Chang further discloses that EPG data, which is in the form of text (*see Figs. 3-5*), is converted to voice data (*i.e., text-to-speech synthesis*) and stored at a network server along with the EPG data (*Fig. 6, Element 86; and Paragraph [0034]*).

With respect to **Claims 22-23**, Chang further discloses:

Presenting a sequence of prompts in text form corresponding to the sequence of aural prompts (*sequence of program selection prompts, Figs. 4-5*).

5. **Claims 5 and 20** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chang

in view of Davis et al in view of Hong and further in view of Oh (*U.S. Patent: 6,141,642*).

With respect to **Claims 5 and 20**, Chang in view of Davis and further in view of Hong discloses the system for receiving, storing, and playing EPG voice data utilizing text-to-speech synthesis, as applied to Claims 1 and 16. Chang in view of Davis and further in view of Hong does not teach speech synthesizers associated with different languages, however, Oh shows:

Converting the text files into speech files using a first text-to-speech (TTS) synthesizer and a second TTS synthesizer, whereby the first TTS synthesizer and the second TTS synthesizer use different languages (*Fig. 2, Elements 212 and 214*).

Chang, Davis, Hong, and Oh are analogous art because they are from a similar field of endeavor in voice data providing systems. Thus, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art, at the time of invention, to modify the teachings of Chang in view of Davis and further in view of Hong with the use of multiple TTS synthesizers corresponding to different languages as taught by Oh in order to provide text-to-speech synthesis for text that appears in multiple languages (*Oh, Col. 1, Lines 49-52*).

6. **Claims 6 and 21** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chang in view of Davis et al in view of Hong et al and further in view of Van Kommer (*U.S. Patent: 6,678,659*).

With respect to **Claims 6 and 21**, Chang in view of Davis and further in view of Hong discloses the system for receiving, storing, and playing EPG voice data utilizing text-to-speech synthesis, as applied to Claims 1 and 16. Chang in view of Davis and further in view of Hong does not teach the ability to select a synthesized voice from a plurality of speech synthesis voice

personalities, however Van Kommer discloses such a selection ability (*Col. 7, Lines 16-27*).

Chang, Davis, Hong, and Van Kommer are analogous art because they are from a similar field of endeavor in voice data providing services. Thus, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art, at the time of invention, to modify the teachings of Chang in view of Davis with the ability to select a synthesized voice from a plurality of voice personalities as taught by Van Kommer in order to allow a user the option of selecting a more suitable synthesized voice (*Van Kommer, Col. 7, Lines 25-27*).

7. **Claim 9** is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chang in view of Davis et al in view of Hong et al and further in view of Cannon et al. (*U.S. Patent: 6,510,209*).

With respect to **Claim 9**, Chang in view of Davis and further in view of Hong discloses the system for receiving, storing, and playing EPG voice data utilizing text-to-speech synthesis, as applied to Claims 1 and 16. Chang in view of Davis and further in view of Hong does not teach presenting configuration prompts to a user and implementing a predetermined input time period after issuing such a prompt, however, Cannon discloses:

(i) Presenting set-up configurations sequentially through the audio speaker (*Fig. 4, Element 412*);

(j) Pausing the audio presented in step (i) between each set-up configuration (*waiting a predetermined time period for an input command, Col. 6, Lines 4-15*); and

(k) Waiting a predetermined time period during each pause to receive an input command (*waiting a predetermined time period for an input command, Col. 6, Lines 4-15*).

Chang, Davis, Hong, and Cannon are analogous art because they are from a similar field of endeavor in audio providing interfaces. Thus, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art, at the time of invention, to modify the teachings of Chang in view of Davis and further in view of Hong with the use of set-up configuration prompts and a predetermined time period for inputting a configuration command as taught by Cannon in order to allow a user to conveniently configure a device from a remote location (*Cannon, Col. 1, Line 66- Col. 2, Line 2*) while only accepting commands for a predetermined time period to prevent an unintended input from being improperly recognized as a command.

8. **Claim 13** is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chang in view of Davis et al in view of Hong et al and further in view of Yuschik (*U.S. Patent: 6,526,382*).

With respect to **Claim 13**, Chang in view of Davis and further in view of Hong discloses the system for receiving, storing, and playing EPG voice data utilizing text-to-speech synthesis, as applied to Claims 1 and 16. Chang further discloses an EPG voice message that includes a channel number, channel name, and program name (*Paragraph [0032]*), but does not teach the EPG voice prompt management recited in claim 13 utilizing pauses. Yuschik, however, recites the well-known concept of inserting pauses between sequentially spoken items (*Col. 20, Lines 41-53; and Fig. 7B*).

Chang, Davis, Hong, and Yuschik are analogous art because they are from a similar field of endeavor in audio providing interfaces. Thus, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art, at the time of invention, to modify the teachings of Chang in view of Davis and further in view of Hong with the pause configuration taught by Yuschik in order to

provide natural sounding separation between a list of items (*program information in the case of Chang/Hong*) (*Yuschik, Col. 19, Lines 45-46*).

9. **Claims 17-19 and 24** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chang (*U.S. Patent Publication: 2004/0168187*) in view of Adams et al ("*IBM Products for Persons with Disabilities*," 1989).

With respect to **Claim 17**, Chang discloses:

A television monitor (*television for display, Paragraph 0037*); and

An information appliance comprising:

A memory device (*voice data and guide memory, paragraph [0020] and Fig. 2, Elements 42 and 44*);

A modem adapted to connect to a network (*communications interface to communicate with a network to receive EPG data, Paragraph [0020]; and Fig 2, Element 38*);

A processor coupled to the modem (*DSP and microcontroller, Fig. 2, Elements 40 and 46*) for (a) communicating on the network (*network communication of EPG data, Paragraphs [0034-0037]*), (b) periodically receiving electronic program guide (EPG) speech files and EPG text files from the network (*daily reception of EPG voice data for a programming interval, Paragraph [0034]; and received EPG data for a programming time block corresponding to different time intervals, Figs. 4-5*), (c) storing the EPG speech files in the memory device (*storing EPG voice data to a voice memory, Paragraph [0020]*) and (d) providing a sequence of aural navigation prompts (*sequence of displayed commands that are spoken to a user, and associated EPG voice data, Paragraphs [0021 and 0031-0032] and Figs. 4-5*),

A receiver for accepting input commands from a remote control, the input commands entered responsive to the sequence of aural navigation prompts (*receiving controller keypad commands at a microcontroller to select a particular television program, Paragraph [0027]*);

An audio speaker configured with the processor to present the sequence of aural navigation prompts (*speaker, Fig. 2, Element 14*); and

The processor responsive to the input commands accepted by the receiver for (a) extracting a portion of the EPG speech files stored in the memory device (*selecting voice messages corresponding to television programs, Paragraph [0032]*), (b) sending the extracted portion of the EPG speech files to the audio speaker (*sending an EPG voice message to a speaker, Paragraph [0032]*), the portion of the EPG speech files corresponding to a particular time interval (*EPG voice data corresponding to a time interval for a particular TV program, Figs. 3 and 5*).

Wherein:

The processor formats the EPG text files into a page of text and the processor provides the page for display on the television monitor, the page including a section, the section including a plurality of subsections (*EPG text is formatted into a grid representation for presentation on a television display, Paragraph 0037; and Fig. 5*),

The extracted portion of the EPG speech files corresponds to the section (*voice data extracted for the displayed EPG sections, Paragraph 0032*),

The receiver accepts an input command which provides an identifier for identifying a location on the page displayed on the television monitor of a sub-section of the plurality of subsections (*Paragraph 0032; and user-controlled cursor, Fig. 5, Element 92*), and the processor

extracts a further portion of the EPG speech files and sends the corresponding further portion of the EPG speech files to the audio speaker (*Paragraph 0032*).

Although Chang discloses the playing voice data for a displayed program guide and the utilization of a user-controlled cursor, as is noted above, Chang does not specifically suggest that further voice data is extracted based on an identified location selected by a user without changing the text of the display. Such technology, however, is readily known in the art as is evidenced by Adams. Adams discloses a screen reader wherein further speech data is extracted and played as items are selected/highlighted on a display screen (*monitor/selector functions, Pages 981-982*).

Chang and Adams are analogous art because they are from a similar field of endeavor in speech-assisted interfaces. Thus, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art, at the time of invention, to modify the teachings of Chang with the cursor/cell based speech data extraction in order to better assist visually impaired users by enabling them to perform the same functions as sighted peers (*Adams, Screen Reader, Page 980*).

With respect to **Claim 18**, Chang further discloses:

The page includes at least one date, multiple channels, multiple times, and at least one legend inserted in a grid (*Paragraph 0026*); the identifier identifies the grid on the page (*Fig. 4, Element 92*); and the further portion of the EPG speech files extracted by the processor includes the legend inserted in the grid (*Fig. 3 and Paragraph 0032*).

With respect to **Claim 19**, Chang further discloses:

Wherein the server includes a storage device for storing the (EPG) text files (*server capable of EPG text data storage, Fig. 6, Element 86; and Paragraph [0034]*), a text-to-speech (TTS) synthesizer for converting the EPG text files into the EPG speech files (*EPG data, which*

is in the form of text (see Figs. 3-5), is converted to voice data (i.e., text-to-speech synthesis) and stored at a network server along with the EPG data (Fig. 6, Element 86; and Paragraph [0034]), and a transmitter for transmitting the EPG text files and the EPG speech files onto the network (transmission of EPG data, Paragraph 0034), the processor receives the EPG speech files in response to a download request from the server; and the download request includes a first download request for the at least one date, multiple channels and multiple times (requested EPG data includes date, channel, and time information, Paragraph 0026), and a second download request for the legend inserted in the grid (EPG data is downloaded upon a request for information and includes particular program legends, See Fig. 4).

With respect to **Claim 24**, Chang further discloses:

Presenting a sequence of prompts in text form corresponding to the sequence of aural prompts (sequence of program selection prompts, Figs. 4-5).

10. **Claim 25** is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chang in view of Davis et al in view of Hong et al and further in view of Adams et al.

With respect to **Claim 25**, Chang in view of Davis and further in view of Hong discloses the speech-assisted EPG interface, as applied to claim 1. Although Davis and Hong further teaches different selectable time periods, as applied to claim 1, Chang, Davis, and Hong fails to teach the speech can be interrupted and a user can skip to another speech section. Adams, however, teaches that speech is output based on a currently highlighted item/cell in a display (Pages 981-982). Thus, if a user were to switch from one item/cell to another, speech would

Art Unit: 2626

inherently be interrupted and speech data corresponding to a different cell would be output (*cells in the case of Chang/Davis/Hong are EPG grid cells*).

Chang, Davis, Hong, and Adams are analogous art because they are from a similar field of endeavor in speech-assisted interfaces. Thus, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art, at the time of invention, to modify the teachings of Chang, Davis, and Hong with the cursor/cell based speech data extraction taught by Adams in order to better assist visually impaired users by enabling them to perform the same functions as sighted peers (*Adams, Screen Reader, Page 980*).

11. **Claim 26** is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chang in view of Davis et al in view of Hong et al and further in view of Asakawa et al (*"User Interface of a Home Page Reader," 1998*).

With respect to **Claim 26**, Chang in view of Davis and further in view of Hong discloses the speech-assisted EPG interface, as applied to claim 1. Chang, Davis, and Hong fails to teach the speech can be paused and resumed at a specific point in time. Asakawa, however, teaches that speech can be paused and resumed at the place where it stopped based on user commands (*Page 152*).

Chang, Davis, Hong, and Asakawa are analogous art because they are from a similar field of endeavor in speech-assisted interfaces. Thus, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art, at the time of invention, to modify the teachings of Chang, Davis, and Hong with the pause functionality taught by Asakawa in order to provide basic speech browsing functions to a visually impaired user (*Asakawa, Pages 149 and 152*).

Allowable Subject Matter

12. **Claims 3-4** are allowable over the prior art of record.
13. The following is an examiner's statement of reasons for allowance:

With respect to **Claim 3**, the prior art of record fails to explicitly teach or fairly suggest, either alone or in combination, a method and system for presenting synthesized speech corresponding to electronic program guide (*EPG*) text, wherein a server converts an *EPG* text into speech (*specification, paragraph [0020]*), stores the speech files (*specification, paragraph [0033]*), receives a request for a portion of the *EPG* text and associated speech for a specific time interval (*specification, paragraphs [0041-0042 and 0050]*), and transmits the *EPG* text and the associated speech files to a user's set top box for storage (*specification, paragraph [0041]*) and playback via navigation through aural prompt responses (*specification, paragraphs [0041-0042 and 0046]*) in combination with *the additional step/means for downloading, at a set top box, additional EPG text and associated speech data from a server in response to a cursor location on an EPG grid (specification, paragraphs [0048-0049])*.

Claim 4 further limits an allowable independent claim, and thus, is also allowable over the prior art of record.

Any comments considered necessary by applicant must be submitted no later than the payment of the issue fee and, to avoid processing delays, should preferably accompany the issue fee. Such submissions should be clearly labeled "Comments on Statement of Reasons for Allowance."

Conclusion

14. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

15. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure: See PTO-892.

16. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to James S. Wozniak whose telephone number is (571) 272-7632. The examiner can normally be reached on M-Th, 7:30-5:00, F, 7:30-4, Off Alternate Fridays.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Patrick Edouard can be reached at (571) 272-7603. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

/James S. Wozniak/
James S. Wozniak
Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2626

/Patrick N. Edouard/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2626